

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application, with each of Claims 1-5 being independent. As indicated above, each of Claims 1-5 is amended.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over *Pinard* (U.S. Patent 5,898,432) in view of *Horwitz et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,866).

Pinard discloses an animated cursor; and, *Horwitz* discloses a computerized program checking system for organizations.

Each of independent Claims 1-5 are amended to more clearly reveal an aspect of the present invention, i.e., “registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator that corresponds to a current state change.”

In rejecting independent Claims 1-5, the Examiner asserts that *Pinard* teaches all the recitations of these claims, except for:

invoking the registered function upon receipt of the user input for designating the individual state indicator (Claim 1);

determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched, upon receipt of the touch screen input, and invoking the registered one of the plurality of functions, when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched (Claim 2);

determining whether a cursor or an input focus is positioned over a representation area of the related individual state indicator, upon receipt of a user button input, and invoking the registered function, when the cursor or input focus is positioned over the representation area of the related

individual state indicator (Claim 3);

determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched, upon receipt of the touch screen input, and invoking the message reading function, when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched (Claim 4); and

determining whether coordinates of a touch screen input indicate that a representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched, upon receipt of the touch screen input, and invoking the alarm function, when the coordinates of the touch screen input indicate that the representation area of the related individual state indicator has been touched (Claim 5),

which are allegedly taught in *Horwitz*.

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner mostly cites *Pinard* at col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 10, and col. 4, lines 11-55, and Figs. 2-5. *Pinard* changes the form of a cursor upon receipt of a signal indicating a ringing of a telephone, an email message waiting to be read, the receipt of a fax, and an alarm. Referring to Figs. 3-5 of *Pinard*, however, these drawings and the description thereof clearly show that a cursor form is changed and it is merely used to indicate that a certain event is newly occurred, but they do not teach that a function corresponding to an occurrence of the event is registered to a corresponding cursor, i.e., registering one of the plurality of functions to the related individual state indicator that corresponds to a current state change, as is recited in Claims 1-5. That is, because the function corresponding to an occurrence of the event is not registered to a corresponding cursor, the cursor cannot be used to operate a related function corresponding to occurrence of the event.

Further, the cursor form as seen in Figs. 3-5 of *Pinard* is not displayed until after a related event occurs. Namely, the cursor of *Pinard*, is displayed merely as an ordinary cursor regardless of a related event, as illustrated in Fig.2. Also, when the relevant event occurs, the cursor is eventually displayed as illustrated in Figs. 3-5.

Further, the flashing icon of *Horwitz* is never displayed until conflict search result occurs, and when the conflict search result occurs, it is eventually displayed (see col. 21, lines 6-11). Therefore,

because the flashing icon of *Horwitz* is initially displayed when a conflict search result occurs, *Horwitz* also never teaches registering functions to a related state indicator, which have already been displayed, or altering state representation, as is recited in Claims 1-5.

As described above, *Pinard* and *Horwitz*, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest registering a function to a related state indicator corresponding to a state change, when the state change occurs, and altering a state representation of the state indicator corresponding to the state indicator as recited in the claims. Further, *Pinard* and *Horwitz*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that a state indicator is displayed before related state change occurs, and when the related state change occurs, a state representation of the state indicator, which is currently being displayed, is altered, as recited in the claims.

Therefore, based at least upon the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1-5 are patentably distinct over *Pinard* in view of *Horwitz*, and it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is believed that all claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-5. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. Owens, III
Reg. No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475